

REMARKS

In the December 15, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-42 were pending in the application; rejected claims 1-4, 8-15, 17-23, 27-33, 35-39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and rejected claims 5-7, 16, 24-26, 34, 40 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patent 6,300,947 to Kanevsky; 6,305,339 to Agraharam et al.; and 5,852,717 to Bhide et al. (References A-C, respectively) were cited. Claim 43 has been added and thus, claims 1-43 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

On pages 2-8 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 8-15, 17-23, 27-33, 35-39 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kanevsky. The independent claims have been amended to clarify that the conversion relates to the "type and format" (e.g., claim 1, line 6) of information, as described at page 5, lines 16-17 of the application. As discussed at the March 4, 2004 Examiner Interview, this is significantly different than changing the way that information is displayed, as taught by Kanevsky.

Since limitations similar to that are quoted above from claim 1 are now recited in the other independent claims 14, 20, 32, 33, 37-39 and 41, it is submitted that claims 1, 14, 20, 32, 33, 37-39 and 41, as well as claims 2-4, 8-13, 15, 17-19, 21-23, 27-31, 35 and 36 which depend therefrom patentably distinguish over Kanevsky for the reasons set forth above.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 8-9, claims 5 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Bhide et al. Only column 12, lines 4-14 of Bhide et al. was cited as relevant to the present invention. This portion of Bhide et al. discloses sending a header from a "client hook" to an agent that "includes information about the browser . . . , acceptable data formats, and the like similar to a Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions . . . header" (column 12, lines 4-7) which is not used in the system taught by Bhide et al., but rather in systems prior to the invention disclosed by Bhide et al. The cited portion of Bhide et al. is only relevant to teaching that the information used by a system according to the present invention is commonly available in the information transmitted by user terminals executing a World Wide Web browser program. Nothing has been found in Bhide et al. that would suggest modification of what is taught by Kanevsky to meet the limitations recited in claim 1 that were quoted above. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 5 and 24 which respectively depend from claims 1 and 20 patentably distinguish over Kanevsky in view of Bhide et al. for the reasons discussed above.

On pages 9-10, claims 6, 7, 16, 25, 26, 34, 40 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Agraharam et al. The only portions of Agraharam et al. that were cited were column 1, lines 47-55 and columns 7, lines 1-12. The first is a portion of the Summary of the Invention describing the downloading of a program to determine the configuration of the terminal "so that the requested information may be formatted and delivered to the end-user in a optimal manner" (column 1, lines 53-55). However, the cited portion of column 7 does not describe how this is accomplished, but rather describes monitoring transmission. The detailed description of the cited portion of the Summary is apparently provided at column 5, line 48 to column 6, line 62. The examples of formatting in this portion of Agraharam et al. are "information format, presentation speed, transmission speed and transmission medium" (column 5, lines 65-67). The conversion process described at column 6, lines 41-51 does not describe what conversions are performed, other than that "controller 302 formats the requested information based on ... parameters" (column 6, lines 48-49) which are described as "appropriate parameters based on the information delivery requirements derived from the user profile for the end-user terminal 114 and the information being requested" (column 6, lines 44-47). While this might suggest that some conversion is needed, it is unclear whether the conversion to be performed is significantly different from that taught by Bhide et al., i.e., formatting data based on the size of the display. Therefore, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found it obvious to perform the conversion of information "type and format" recited in the independent claims based upon a combination of the teaching in Kanevsky and Agraharam et al. For the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 6, 7, 16, 25, 26, 34, 40 and 42 patentably distinguish over Kanevsky in view of Agraharam et al.

Request for Examiner Interview

If the amended claim language is not considered clear enough to distinguish over Kanevsky, the Examiner is respectfully request to contact the undersigned by telephone to arrange an Examiner Interview prior to issuing an Advisory Action, so that alternative language more clearly defining the differences between the present invention and Kanevsky can be submitted.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-43 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4/5/04

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501